

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXII. No. 1.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 4, 1812.

[Price 1s.]

"That the Election of Members of Parliament ought to be free."—BILL OF RIGHTS.

1]

[2

## TO THE INDEPENDENT ELECTORS OF BRISTOL.

### LETTER I.

Gentlemen,

Your City, the third in England in point of population, and, for the bravery and public-spirit of its inhabitants the first in the world, is now become, with all those who take an interest in the public welfare, an object of anxious attention. You, as the Electors of Westminster were, have long been the sport of the two artful factions, who have divided between them the profits arising from the obtaining of your votes. One of each faction has always been elected; and, as one of them always belonged to the faction *out of place*, you, whose intentions and views were honest, consoled yourselves with the reflection, that, if one of your members was in place, or belonged to the IN party, your other member, who belonged to the OUT party, was always in the House to watch him. But, now, I think, experience must have convinced you, that the OUT as well as the IN member was always seeking his own gain at your expense and that of the nation; and that the two factions, though openly hostile to each other, have always been perfectly well agreed as to the main point; namely, the perpetuating of those sinecure places and all those other means by which the public money is put into the pockets of individuals.

With this conviction in your minds, it is not to be wondered at that you are now beginning to make a stand for the remnant of your liberties; and, as I am firmly persuaded, that your success would be of infinite benefit to the cause of freedom in general, and, of course, to our country, now groaning under a compilation of calamities, I cannot longer withhold a public expression of the sentiments which I entertain respecting the struggle in which you are engaged; and especially respecting the *election now going on*, the proceedings of a *recent meeting in London*, and the *pretensions*

*of Mr. Hunt* compared with those of Sir Samuel Romilly.

As to the first, you will bear in mind, Gentlemen, how often we, who wish for a reform of the parliament, have contended, that no member of the House of Commons ought to be a placeman or a pensioner. We have said, and we have shown, that in that Act of Parliament by virtue of which the present family was exalted to the throne of this kingdom; we have shown, that, by that Act, it was provided that *no man having a pension or place of emolument under the Crown should be capable of being a member of the House of Commons*. It is, indeed, true, that this provision has since been *repealed*; but, it having been enacted, and that, too, on so important an occasion, shows clearly how jealous our ancestors were upon the subject.

—When we ask for a revival of this law, we are told that it cannot be wanted; because, if a man be a placeman or a pensioner *before* he be chosen at all, those who choose him know it, and if they like a placeman or a pensioner, who else has any thing to do with the matter? And, if a man be made a placeman or pensioner *after* he be chosen, he must *vacate his seat*, and return to his constituents to be re-elected before he can sit again; if they reject him he cannot sit, and, if they re-choose him, who else has any thing to do with the matter?

To be sure it is pretty impudent for these people to talk to us about *choice* and about *re-choosing* and about *rejecting* and the like, when they know that we are well informed of the nature of choosings and re-choosings at Old Sarum, at Gatton, at Queenborough, at Bodmin, at Penryn, at Honiton, at Oakhampton, and at more than a hundred other places; it is pretty impudent to talk to us about members *going back to their constituents* at such places as those here mentioned; but, what will even the impudence of these people find to say in the case of those members, who, upon having grasped places or pensions, do go back to their constituents, and upon being rejected by them, go to some ho-



rough where the people have no voice; or who, not relishing the prospect, do not go to face their former constituents, but go, at once, to some borough, and there take a seat, which, by cogent arguments, no doubt, some one has been prevailed on to go out of to make way for them? What will even the impudence of the most prostituted knaves of hired writers find to say in cases like these?

Of the former MR. GEORGE TIERNEY presents a memorable instance. He was formerly a member for Southwark, chosen on account of his professions in favour of freedom, by a numerous body of independent electors. But, having taken a fancy to a place which put some thousands a year of the public money into his own individual pocket, having had the assurance to go back to his constituents, and having been by them *rejected* with scorn, he was immediately *chosen* by some borough where a seat had been emptied in order to receive him, and now he is a representative of the people of a place called *Bandon Bridge in Ireland*, a place which, in all probability, he never saw, and the inhabitants of which are, I dare say, wholly unconscious of having the honour to be represented by so famous a person. Your late representative, MR. BRAGGE BATHURST, has acted a more modest, or, at least, a more prudent part. He has got a fat place, a place the profits of which would find some hundreds of Englishmen's families in provisions all the year round; he has been made what is called *Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster*, which will give him immense patronage, and, of course, afford him ample means of enriching his family, friends, and dependents, besides his having held places of great salary for many years before. Thus loaded with riches arising from the public means, he does not, I perceive, intend to *face you*; he cannot, it seems, screw himself up to that pitch. We shall, in all likelihood, see, in a few days, what borough opens its chaste arms to receive him; but, as a matter of much greater consequence, I now beg to offer you some remarks upon the measures that have been taken to supply his place.

It was announced to his supporters at Bristol, about three months ago, that he did not mean to offer himself for that city again, and MR. RICHARD HART DAVIS, of whom you will hear enough, came forward as his successor; openly avowing all his principles, and expressly saying, that he would tread in his steps. What those

steps are, you have seen; and what those principles are the miserable people of England feel in the effects of war and taxation. But, I beg your attention to some circumstances connected with the election, which ought to be known and long borne in mind. The WRIT for electing a member for Bristol in the room of Bragge Bathurst was moved for, in the House of Commons, on Tuesday evening, the 23d of June, and, at the same moment, a writ for electing a member for Colchester, in the room of Richard Hart Davis, was moved for. So, you see, they both vacate at the same instant; your man not liking to go down to Bristol, the other vacates a seat for another place, in order to go down to face you in his stead. Observe, too, with what *quickness* the thing is managed. Nobody knows, or, at least, none of you know, that Bragge is going to vacate his seat. Davis apparently knew it, because we see him *vacating at the same moment*. The WRIT is sent off the same night; it gets to Bristol on Wednesday morning the 24th; the law requires *four days notice* on the part of the Sheriffs; they give it, and the election comes on the next Monday. So, you see, if MR. HUNT had been living in Ireland or Scotland, or even in the Northern counties of England, or in some parts of Cornwall, the election might have been over, before there would have been a POSSIBILITY of his getting to Bristol. And though his place of residence was within thirty miles of London, he who was at home on his farm, had but just time to reach you soon enough to give you an opportunity of exercising your rights upon this occasion. Mr. Hunt *could* not know that the writ was moved for till Wednesday evening; living, as he does, at a distance from a post town; and, as it happened, he did not know of it, I believe, till Thursday night; so that, it was next to impossible for him to come to London (which, I suppose, was necessary) and to reach Bristol before Saturday. While, on the other hand, Mr. Davis had chosen his time, and, of course, had made all his preparations.

Such, Gentlemen, have been the means used preparatory to the election. Let us now see what a scene your city exhibits at this moment; first, however, taking a look at the *under-plot going on in London* in favour of Sir Samuel Romilly.

It is stated in the London news-papers, and particularly in the *Times* of Saturday last, that there was a meeting, on Friday, at the Crown and Anchor in the Strand,



the object of which meeting was, "to raise money" by subscription for "supporting the election of Sir Samuel Romilly at Bristol;" and it is added, that a large sum was accordingly raised. This meeting appears to me to have for its object the deceiving of the electors of Bristol; an object, however, which I am satisfied will not be accomplished to any great extent. I do not mean to say, that Sir Samuel Romilly would use deceit; but, I am quite sure, that there are those who would use it upon this occasion. The truth is, that the raising of these large sums of money (amounting already, they say, to £8,000) proves that Sir Samuel Romilly does not put his trust in the FREE VOICE of the people of Bristol. At this meeting Mr. BARING, one of the persons *who makes the loans to the government*, was in the chair. This alone is a circumstance sufficient to enable you to judge not only of the *character* of the meeting, but also of what sort of conduct is *expected* from Sir Samuel Romilly if he were placed in parliament by the means of this subscription. Mr. WHITBREAD was also at the meeting, and spoke in favour of the subscription. But, we must not be carried away by *names*. Mr. Whitbread does many good things; but Mr. Whitbread is not always right. Mr. Whitbread *subscribed to bring Mr. Sheridan in for Westminster*, and was, indeed, the man who caused him to obtain the appearance of a majority; Mr. Whitbread supported that same Sheridan afterwards against Lord Cochrane; and though Mr. Whitbread is so ready to subscribe now, *he refused to subscribe to the election of Sir Francis Burdett*, notwithstanding the election was in a city of which he was an inhabitant and an Elector. These, Gentlemen, are facts, of which you should be apprized; otherwise *names* might deceive you.

I beg to observe also, that, at this meeting, there was nothing said about a *parliamentary reform*, without which you must be satisfied no good of any consequence can be done. There was, indeed, a Mr. MILLS, who said he came from Bristol, who observed that "the great majority of the inhabitants of Bristol *felt* perfectly convinced of the necessity of SOMETHING LIKE Reform." And is this all? Does your conviction go no farther than this? I remember, that, when a little boy, I was crying to my mother for a bit of bread and cheese, and that a journeyman carpenter, who was at work hard by, compassionately

offered to chalk me out a big piece upon a board. I forget the way in which I vented my rage against him; but, the offer has never quitted my memory. Yet, really, this seems to come up to the notion of Mr. Mills: the carpenter offered me SOMETHING LIKE a big piece of bread and cheese. Oh! no, Gentlemen, it is not this *something like* that you want: you want *the thing itself*; and, if Sir Samuel Romilly meant that you should have it, do you believe, that neither he, nor any one for him, would have made any specific promise upon the subject? Even after Mr. Mills had said that you wanted *something like* Reform, there was nobody who ventured to say, that Sir Samuel Romilly would endeavour to procure even that for you. His friends were told, that, if he would distinctly pledge himself to reform, whether *in place or out of place*, Mr. Hunt, who only wished to see that measure accomplished, would himself assist in his election; but, this Sir Samuel Romilly has not done, and, therefore, he is not the man whom you ought to choose, though he is beyond all comparison better than hundreds of other public men, and though he is, in many respects, a most excellent member of parliament. Gentlemen, these friends of Sir Samuel Romilly call upon you to choose him, because he is, they tell you, a decided enemy of the measures of the present ministers. Now, they must very well know, that *all those measures have had the decided support of the parliament*. Well, then, do these his friends allow, that the parliament are the real representatives of the people, and that they speak the people's voice? If Sir Samuel's friends do allow this, then they do, in fact, say, that he is an enemy to all those measures which the people's voice approves of; and, if they do not allow this, if they say that the parliament do *not* speak the people's voice and are *not* their real representatives, how can they hope that any man will do you any good who is not decidedly for a *reform of that parliament*? Let the meeting at the Crown and Anchor answer these questions, or, in the name of decency, I conjure them to hold their tongues, and to put their subscriptions back again into their pockets.

To say the truth (and this is not a time to disguise it from you) this subscription is a subscription *against*, and not *for*, the freedom of election. If Sir Samuel Romilly's friends were willing to put their trust in the free good will of the people of Bristol, why raise money in such large



quantities, and especially why resort to *party men* and to *loan makers* for this purpose? They will say, perhaps, that the money is intended for the purpose of carrying down the *London voters* and for that of fetching voters from elsewhere; but, why are they afraid to put their trust in the *resident voters* of Bristol? The object of this subscription is very far indeed from resembling the object of that which was set on foot in Westminster, which was not to gain votes by dint of money, but merely to pay the expenses of printing, of clerks, and other little matters inseparable from an election at Westminster, and the whole of which did not amount to more than about *eight hundred pounds*; whereas as many thousands are stated to be already subscribed for procuring the election of Sir Samuel Romilly. In short, this attempt of the friends of Sir Samuel Romilly is like many others that have been made before. It is *purse against purse*. Mr. PROTHERO has shaken his purse at Sir Samuel; and, as the latter does not choose to engage with his own purse, his friends, with a *loan maker at their head*, came forward to make up a purse for him; and the free and unbought voice of the electors of Bristol is evidently intended by neither party to have any weight at all in the decision.

Let us now return and take a view of the political picture which Bristol at this moment presents. And, here, the first observation that strikes one, is, that neither the friends of Sir Samuel Romilly nor the friends of Mr. Prothero say one word in opposition to Mr. HART DAVIS, though he avowedly stands upon the principles of Mr. Bragge and the present ministers; though he quitted his canvass about ten weeks ago, to come express to London to vote in favour of the Orders in Council; and though he now says, that he will tread in the steps of Mr. Bragge. Though they have all this before their eyes, not one single syllable does any one of them utter against the pretensions or the movements of Mr. Davis; and, though the meeting at the Crown and Anchor took place several days after the Bristol and Colchester writs were moved for, and though the parties at the meeting must necessarily have been well acquainted with all that I have above stated to you upon the subject of those writs, not one word did they utter against the pretensions of Mr. Davis, nor did they (according to the printed report of their proceedings) mention his name, or take the smallest notice of the circumstance, that an election,

a little, snug, rotten-borough-like election, was, at that moment, getting up in that very city, for the *interest* and *honour* of which they were affecting so much concern! And, can you, then, believe them sincere? Can you believe, that they have any other view than merely that of securing *a seat for the party* in Bristol? Can you doubt, that the contest, on their part, is not for the *principle* but for the *seat*?

Having pointed out this circumstance to your attention, it is hardly necessary for me to advert to the conduct of Mr. Hunt, which, in this case in particular, forms a contrast with that of the other parties too striking not to have produced a lasting impression upon your minds. He does not content himself with *talking* about defending your liberties. He *acts* as well as *talks*. He hears that the enemy is in your camp, and he flies to rescue you from his grasp. He does not waste his time in a tavern in London, drawing up flourishing resolutions about "*public spirit*." He hastens amongst you; he *looks your and his adversary in the face*; he shows you that you may depend upon him in the hour of trial. These, Gentlemen, are marks of such a character in a representative as the times demand. Sir Samuel Romilly is a very worthy gentleman; an honest man; a humane man; a man that could not, in my opinion, be, by any means, tempted to do a cruel or dishonest act; and he is, too, a man of great talents. But, I have no scruple to say, that I should prefer, and greatly prefer, Mr. Hunt to Sir Samuel Romilly, as a member of parliament; for, while I do not know, and do not believe, that the latter excels the former in honesty or humanity, I am convinced that his talents, though superior, perhaps, in their kind, are not equal, in value to the public, to the talents possessed by Mr. Hunt, who is, at this moment, giving you a specimen of the effect of those talents.

Gentlemen, the predominance of *Lawyers*, in this country, has produced amongst us a very erroneous way of thinking with respect to the talents of public men; and, contrary to the notions of the world in general, we are apt to think a man great in mind in proportion to the glibness of his tongue. With us, to be a *great talker* is to be a *great man*; but, perhaps, a falser rule of judging never was adopted. It is so far from being true as a general maxim, that it is generally the contrary of the truth; and, if you look back through the list of our own public men, you will find,





that, in general, they have been shallow and mischievous in proportion to their gift of talking. We have been brought to our present miserable state by a lawyer-like policy, defended in lawyer-like debates. Plain good sense has been brow-beaten out of countenance; has been talked down, by the politicians from the bar; haranguing and special pleading and quibbling have usurped the place of frank and explicit statement and unsophistical reasoning. In Mr. Hunt you have no lawyer, but you have a man who is not to be brow-beaten into silence. You have a man not to be intimidated by the frowns or the threats of wealth or of rank; a man not to be induced to abandon his duty towards you from any considerations of danger to himself; and, I venture to foretel (begging that my words may be remembered) that, if you elect him, the whole country will soon acknowledge the benefit conferred on it by the city of Bristol.

Gentlemen, this letter will, in all likelihood, find you engaged in the bustle of an election. With all the advantages on the side of your adversary, you may not, perhaps, upon the *present* occasion, be able to defeat him. But, you will have a chance; you will have an opportunity of trying; you will have *an election*; and this you would not have had if it had not been for Mr. Hunt, for the whole affair would have been over before you had scarcely *heard* of it. At the very least you will have *some days of liberty to speak your minds*; to tell Mr. Davis what you think of him and of his predecessor; to declare aloud your grievances and your indignation; and even for *this* liberty you will be indebted to Mr. Hunt, and *solely* to Mr. Hunt. You are told of the *zeal* of Mr. Prothero and Sir Samuel Romilly in your service; you are told of their desire to promote your *interest* and your *honour*; but, where are they *now*? Where are they when the enemy is in your city, when you were to have been handed over from Bragge Bathurst to Hart Davis as quietly as if you had been a cargo of tallow or of corn? It is now, it is in this moment of real need, that Mr. Hunt comes to your aid; and, if he fail in defeating, he will, at the least, harass your enemy, make his victory over you cost him dear, and by exposing the sources and means of his success, lay the foundation of his future defeat and disgrace.

I am, your friend,

WM. COBBETT.

*State Prison, Newgate,  
Monday, 29th June, 1812.*

## THE LUDDITES.

### No. I.

*Message of the Prince Regent to the two Houses of Parliament.—Sealed Papers and Secret Committee.—Nature of the Ballot for a Committee.—Publications in the TIMES and COURIER news-papers for the purpose of feeling the public pulse.*

“Englishmen, now is your time to watch  
“the WHIGS!”

This is the title which I intend to give to the several articles, which I shall necessarily have to write upon the subject of the measures now about to be adopted by the government, with regard to the counties of England, which have, for some time past, been in a state of disturbance.—It is well known, that the frame-breakers in Nottingham took the name of *Luddites*; that this name has since spread into the neighbouring counties; and that several counties have, for many months, been in a state of great trouble.—On Saturday, the 27th of June, the following Message was delivered to the two Houses of Parliament, to the Lords by VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH and to the Commons by LORD CASTLEREAGH.—“GEORGE P. R.—His Royal Highness, the Prince Regent, in the name and on behalf of his Majesty, has given orders that there be laid before the House of Commons, Copies of Information received by his Majesty’s Government, relative to certain violent and dangerous proceedings, in defiance of the laws, which have taken place, and which continue to take place, in certain counties of the kingdom.—His Royal Highness confidently relies on the wisdom of the House of Commons that they will adopt such measures as are necessary to secure the lives and property of the peaceable and loyal inhabitants of the disturbed districts, and to restore order and tranquillity.”—The first remark that presents itself here is, that, so long as three weeks ago, Lord Castlereagh assured the House of Commons, that the accounts which were received by government from the disturbed counties were very satisfactory, more and more so every day.—Either, therefore, he was misinformed, or the people have relapsed.—On Monday the 29th of June, both Houses voted, without a division, an Address to the Regent, promising to take the subject into their consideration, and to adopt such measures as might be necessary to ensure the end pointed out in the latter part of the Message.



—Upon this VITAL subject we must be very particular as to the *names* of all the actors.—Lord Liverpool supported the motion in the Lords, which was made by Lord Sidmouth; and Lord Stanhope moved an amendment, the object of which was to shut out any project for *suspending the Habeas Corpus Act*. Lord Holland went with Lord Stanhope; but the motion was adopted.—N. B. Not a word against the motion by Lord Grenville or Lord Grey.—In the Commons the motion was made by LORD CASTLEREAGH. Mr. Whitbread and Sir Francis Burdett expressed their hope that nothing was about to be attempted against the great constitutional laws of England.—The next thing that was done was the making of a motion in both Houses for the appointment of a SECRET Committee to examine and report upon certain papers that were laid upon the table, SEALED UP! The motion was, in the House of Commons (to which we will now confine ourselves), that the Committee should be appointed by *ballot*; that is to say, in fact, *appointed by the ministry*.—What passed upon this subject was very interesting indeed. I will, therefore, insert it, and I beg the reader, especially if he be a young man, to make a point of bearing it in mind.—“LORD CASTLEREAGH then moved, that the Papers he had this day presented, should be referred to a Committee, that it be a Committee of Secrecy, and that the number of Members be 21, which were severally ordered. His Lordship likewise moved, that the members be chosen by *ballot*.—MR. WHITBREAD protested against this mode of proceeding, since, *it would give the Noble Lord the appointment of every Member of the Committee*. He wished that the Members of it should be publicly named and chosen, that the House, and not the Noble Lord, might have the formation of the Committee. (*Hear!*)—“LORD CASTLEREAGH persisted in his motion, since he was certain that on no side of the House on such a question would party feelings be exercised; he was convinced that it would be treated by Parliament in a manner, which while it did it honour, would give satisfaction to the people.—SIR F. BURDETT, looking at the precedents to which Mr. Whitbread had referred, could not help feeling great jealousy as to the conduct of Government; he hoped that the bounds of the Constitution would not a-new be transgressed by them. The mode in

“which the Committee was formed, if the satisfaction of the people were looked to, was of the utmost importance. (*Hear, hear!*)—It ought to be of such a description, that the country would place reliance upon its wisdom and impartiality, and not to be merely composed of the creatures of ministerial nomination. —The question, that the Committee be chosen by ballot was then put and carried, though there were a long number of dissentient voices.—On the question that Members prepare lists, and appear to-morrow to put them into the classes appointed for their reception, Mr. WHITBREAD declared that he should not attend for that purpose, as experience had shewn that it would be useless, since any list he might prepare would be smothered in the vast heap of names supplied by the Noble Lord and his political friends.—It was ordered that the Papers communicated by the Prince Regent should remain sealed until the appointment of the Committee.”—From this the reader will form his opinion of the nature of a ballot. But, indeed, a *ballot* is no more than this. Every member present at a given time, puts a ballot into a box, or something, with a list of any 21 members' names that he may choose to write on a ballot. When the Speaker takes out the ballots, he counts the number of times that he finds the several names written. These 21 members whose names are written the greatest number of times are the Committee. From this it follows, of course, that the *majority* of the House select the Committee. The name of ballot does, doubtless, lead some persons to suppose, that the names of all the members are put into a box, and that, as in the case of a *common jury*, the first twenty-one names drawn out are the names of the Committee; but, after what has been said above, no one will be deceived upon this subject again.—The ministry did not, during the debate, develope their intended schemes. But, on the contrary, appeared extremely anxious to avoid making any explicit statement upon the subject. Mr. Whitbread, however, took occasion to anticipate any attempt upon the constitutional laws, as did also Sir Francis Burdett, and the former warned the ministers (by bidding them look at the example of other countries) of the consequences of resorting to measures unwarranted by the usual laws of the country. Mr. *Wilberforce* said something, and, as it was curious, we will have it upon record.



“He entirely participated in the hope, that  
 “nothing would be found in the documents  
 “laid upon the table to call for any extra-  
 “ordinary measures. He would not allow  
 “himself even to express an opinion, lest  
 “it might give rise to feelings that ought  
 “to be banished from all minds, that might  
 “produce dissent instead of union, for the  
 “accomplishment of an object of the great-  
 “est magnitude, *not being at all acquainted*  
 “*with the nature of the papers supplied,*  
 “and not having been present on Saturday  
 “when the Message was brought down, he  
 “was, perhaps, of all men, the least com-  
 “petent to offer any thing to the House,  
 “but he could not avoid rising to express  
 “a wish, that *the utmost calmness and*  
 “*moderation might be observed in the deli-*  
 “*beration.* Nearly connected as he was  
 “*with a district of the country most dis-*  
 “*turbed,* he felt it necessary to conjure the  
 “House, that the case of these unfortunate  
 “and misguided people might be fully and  
 “candidly weighed, that the result might  
 “be the restoration of order, unanimity,  
 “prosperity, and happiness.”—This is  
 a very curious speech. To *speak, and say*  
*less than is here said,* I should think ex-  
 tremely difficult. We will, reader, if you  
 please, shew our respect towards this ho-  
 nourable member by keeping a steady eye  
 upon him all through this affair. I re-  
 member his conduct at the times when for-  
 mer measures of the kind now in contem-  
 plation were proposed. I remember him  
 at the time of *the Bank stoppage,* and upon  
 various other trying occasions.—While  
 these things were going on in parliament,  
 the venal press was not idle; especially the  
 news-papers called the *Times* and the *Cou-*  
*rier.* These prints began, at once, to pave  
 the way for what was intended to follow;  
 they began to feel the pulse of the people.  
 The Message was carried down, as we have  
 seen, on Saturday, and, on Monday morn-  
 ing the former of these prints began to an-  
 nounce, that it wished to see the rioters  
 “*put out of the protection of the law;*”  
 alleging, as a reason, that they were be-  
 come *assassins and incendiaries.* But, even  
 assassins and incendiaries have hitherto had  
 the *law* applied to their case. I do not  
 know why the word *assassin* is now so  
 much in use. It seems that there are peo-  
 ple who think it more horrible in its sound  
 than the word *murderer.* Be this as it  
 may, however, we have *laws* for the pu-  
 nishment of persons guilty of *murder* and  
*arson.* If this is all, we want no new  
 laws. “When,” says the vile *Times,*

“they became *assassins* and *incendiaries,*  
 “they put themselves *out of the protection*  
 “*of the LAW, and JUSTICE* must be  
 “done upon them.” This is an excellent  
 phrase? The *law* is to be laid aside, and  
*justice* is to be done! Very good, indeed!  
 But, this is the sort of trash that delight the  
 readers of this corrupt vehicle. In his  
 paper of the 30th of June, this writer calls  
 the people in the disturbed counties “aban-  
 “doned *revolutionary miscreants.*” In  
 short, he says every thing which malice  
 and cruelty can suggest to him in order to  
 prepare beforehand for a justification of  
 any measures of severity that may be  
 adopted. The *Courier,* the faithful fellow-  
 labourer of the former print, sets about  
 its work in a more elaborate manner. It  
 begins, on Monday, the 29th of June,  
 with accounts of acts of violence commit-  
 ted in Yorkshire, Staffordshire, and Not-  
 tinghamshire. And, having inserted those  
 accounts, the hireling next sets about his  
 work, the recommending of *a suspension*  
*of the Habeas Corpus Act,* and the putting  
 the country *under martial law.* These  
 things he talks of as coolly as Lord Liver-  
 pool, some years back, talked of *a march*  
*to Paris.*—Reader, does not this last  
 sentence bring you back to the outset of the  
 French Revolution, when this nation went  
 to war to keep down republicans and le-  
 vellers? Really the contest has brought  
 us to something at last! How far farther  
 it will take us I do not know.—To re-  
 turn now to the accounts from the troubled  
 counties, I think it necessary to insert them  
 here; because, it will, hereafter, be very  
 useful to be able to recur to these *dawnings*  
 of a state of things, the like of which this  
 country has not seen for a great while, and  
 which will, if I mistake not, make a very  
 considerable figure in history.—The  
*Courier* begins with Nottingham, a place  
 at the very name of which every hireling’s  
 knees knock together. To be sure, he has  
 nothing here to speak of but a squabble at  
 the play-house; but, of that he makes the  
 most. I beg the reader to pay attention to  
 the Story. “*Nottingham, 26 June.*—The  
 “Theatre at this place has been abruptly  
 “closed by command of the Town Magis-  
 “trates in consequence of the tumultuous  
 “proceedings that have taken place on  
 “several successive evenings, occasioned  
 “by a request made to the Orchestra to  
 “play the NATIONAL air of *God save*  
 “*the King.* On the tune being called for  
 “it has generally been accompanied with  
 “a cry of “*hats off,*” which has produced



“ the most violent opposition on the part  
 “ of those who are *any thing but loyal*.  
 “ Instead of *complying with the request*,  
 “ the Oppositionists answer it with a cry  
 “ of “ *Millions be free!*” and rising with  
 “ their hats on, place themselves in the  
 “ most menacing attitude of defiance. This  
 “ act of INDECENCY has frequently led  
 “ to blows, and individuals in the boxes  
 “ have been obliged to seek their personal  
 “ safety by leaping into the pit, while  
 “ those in the pit have placed themselves  
 “ in array against the boxes, and a general  
 “ contest or tumult has been the result.  
 “ In several instances *tickets have been dis-*  
 “ *tributed, gratis, to the amount of several*  
 “ *pounds, with a view to beat down the*  
 “ *loyal party by main force*, in consequence  
 “ of which several OFFICERS have been  
 “ insulted, and mal-treated, particularly  
 “ on Wednesday evening last, when a  
 “ number of those desperadoes surrounded  
 “ Brigade-Major HUMPHRYS, on coming  
 “ out of the Theatre, hooted him along  
 “ the streets to his quarters, and threw a  
 “ bottle in his face which cut him severely.  
 “ Brigade-Major HUMPHRYS is a most *gen-*  
 “ *tlemanly character*, who had never taken  
 “ any part whatever in the disturbances,  
 “ but that he was a military officer was  
 “ quite sufficient. On another occasion, a  
 “ party way-laid an officer of the 2d So-  
 “ merset Militia who had been *forward in*  
 “ *displaying his zeal and loyalty to his*  
 “ *King at the Theatre*, in the Park, late  
 “ in the evening, and beat him in a most  
 “ inhuman manner. Several have been  
 “ compelled to enter into recognizances for  
 “ their good behaviour, and two or three  
 “ are bound over to appear at the Quarter  
 “ Sessions, for the assault committed on  
 “ the officer in the Park. This evening  
 “ was fixed for the benefit of Mr. Robert-  
 “ son, one of our highly respected Ma-  
 “ nagers, who calculated upon a net re-  
 “ ceipt of at least £100.; but by the ab-  
 “ rupt closing of the Theatre, his benefit  
 “ is necessarily postponed until after the  
 “ races, which it is supposed will be a  
 “ great loss to him.”—Now, reader, if  
 you examine this matter, you will find,  
 that, even upon their own showing, the  
 God-save-the-King party have been the  
 aggressors.—What right, I should like  
 to know, has one part of an audience at a  
 public theatre to compel the other part,  
 however small that other part may be, to  
 stand up, or to pull off their hats, upon  
 the playing of a tune or the singing of a  
 song, called for by the former? And, if

this right exists in no case, it surely cannot  
 exist when, as appears to have been the  
 case here, the party, taking upon them to  
 give the command is the least numerous.  
 Well might the theatre be shut up, if the  
 manager would suffer the *few* amongst his  
 audience to hector over the *many*.—This  
 writer calls the tune of *God save the King*  
 “ the NATIONAL air.” But, he has  
 not cited to us any law by which we are  
 compelled to rise and pull off our hats at  
 the playing of it. He may like it, and so  
 may the Officers at Nottingham, though  
 the language is a rare specimen of stupid  
 verbosity and tautology; though some of  
 the sentiments, as far as they can be called  
 sentiments, are at once malignant, abject,  
 and impious; and though the whole, when  
 considered with reference to the unfortu-  
 nate personage whose name is the chief  
 burden of the song, amounts to a species  
 of burlesque the most disgusting that can  
 be conceived, still it may accord with the  
 taste of the military officers quartered at  
 Nottingham, and they may, if they choose,  
 consider the air as *national* and have it  
 played accordingly at their mess-rooms.  
 But, if we leave them to their taste, we  
 shall not agree to subject the people of  
 Nottingham thereto; we shall not agree  
 that they have a right to cram their  
 sentiments down the throats of the peo-  
 ple of that town, or any other town or  
 county.—Observe, reader, that it is  
 not the people who *begin* the quarrel.  
 The others call for the tune; it is *played*;  
 no interruption is given by the people.  
 But, this is not enough. The people must  
 not only sit and hear that which they dis-  
 approve of; but, they must, at the *word*  
 of *command*, pull off their hats, as a mark  
 of *approbation* of that which they are known  
 to disapprove of, and that, too, at the  
 order of a comparatively small part of the  
 audience. Can subservience; can slavery,  
 go lower than this? And, if the people  
 of Nottingham were compelled to submit  
 to this, what impudence would it be in  
 them to affect to revile any other people as  
 slaves!—To this last stage of servility  
 the people of Nottingham were not, it  
 seems, disposed to submit; but, in an-  
 swer to the *word of command*, they rose  
 and exclaimed, “ MILLIONS BE FREE;  
 “ placing themselves, at the same time,  
 “ in a most *menacing* attitude of DEFI-  
 “ ANCE.” Of *defiance*, mind. Not of  
 aggression. And, what could be more  
 proper? Yet this hireling calls it an “ act  
 “ of *indecenty!*” Slave, dost thou, then,



think an act of indecency in Englishmen to answer an arbitrary and insolent command by an exclamation expressive of their love of freedom? Dost thou, then, slave as thou art, think this an act of *indecency*; and hast thou the impudence to give utterance and publicity to thy thought? —If the people of Nottingham were to submit to this command to pull their hats off in the play-house, why not in the street? And, if to pull off their hats, why not to go down upon their knees, or to *turn out their pockets*? Loss of property and loss of liberty are never far asunder. —As to the assaults, committed on the bodies of the two military officers, if they were *unprovoked*, the parties ought to be punished; but, it will be observed, that we here have but *one side of the story*, and that every story has two sides. The story comes, too, from a man (if one ought to call him such), who looks upon it as an act of *indecency* for Englishmen, when arbitrarily and insolently commanded to pull off their hats, refuse to comply, and exclaim that they are free. This being the sort of persons from whom the story comes, we ought to distrust, and, indeed, to disbelieve every word of it that makes against the people of Nottingham. —One of these officers had, we are told, “been forward in displaying his *zeal* and *loyalty* to his King at the theatre.” That is to say, he had been (according to this writer’s previous account) *forward in commanding the men of Nottingham to pull off their hats*. The gentleman, whoever he is (and he is *not named*), might have found a better way than this of displaying his zeal and loyalty. There is very little loyalty in the bawling out of a stupid song; but, that would have been a good in endeavouring to conciliate the people, amongst whom he was quartered. —In short, it is clear, that these rows at the theatre at Nottingham have been provoked by the unbearable insolence of a few of those persons, who assume to themselves the exclusive merit of *loyalty*. Nothing can be clearer than this, even from the statement of this hireling himself; and, therefore, it appears to me, that the conduct of the *manager* of the theatre has been unjustifiable. It was for *him* to express his disapprobation of the conduct of those, who were taking upon them to give commands to the audience, and turn a place of recreation, where every man had equal rights, into a scene of political triumph of the few over the thoughts and wishes of the many; and, in not having expressed this disapprobation, he ap-

pears to me to have tacitly taken part with insolent commanders. I am not, therefore, at all sorry for his loss; and, I hope, that, unless he makes atonement by restoring *freedom* to his theatre, he will be left to exhibit his scenes to his exclusively “loyal” customers and to them only. —So much for the accounts from Nottingham. Let us now hear those from other places. I shall insert them one after another without any interruption.

“HUDDERSFIELD (Yorkshire), *June 25.*

“—Last Monday, about midnight, a great number of armed men, with their faces disfigured by broad black marks down each cheek and over the forehead, assembled near the dwelling-house of Mr. Fisher, a shopkeeper of Briestwistle, in this neighbourhood, and after firing two guns or pistols, demanded admittance into Mr. Fisher’s house, which he refused. They then broke open the door, and two of them rushing into the house, seized Mr. Fisher, who had just got out of bed; they each presented a pistol to his breast, and threatened him with instant death if he stirred a foot. Not intimidated by this threat, Mr. Fisher rushed from them towards the door, when he was seized by other six men, who placing a sheet over his head, face, and arms, kept him in that situation while their comrades ransacked the house, and took from his pocket-book bills to the amount of 116*l.* besides 20*l.* in notes and some cash; they also took a quantity of notes and cash out of a drawer, but to what amount Mr. Fisher does not exactly know. When the depredation was completed, the leader cried out to the guard placed over Mr. Fisher, ‘Let him go; don’t hurt him; we have got what we wanted, and we will bring it back in three months,’ and immediately made off.”

“SHEFFIELD (Yorkshire), *June 27.*—

“We are sorry to learn, from the resolutions of the meeting of Lieutenancy and Magistrates, that the nightly depredations, and other most violent breaches of the peace, in a great part of the manufacturing districts of this Riding, still continue. The most effective measures are immediately to be taken to stop the career of the lawless offenders.”

“STAFFORD (Staffordshire), *June 27.*—

“In the beginning of the last week, a strong body of those deluded men, calling themselves *Luddites*, surrounded the house of a lady, the widow of an of-



“ficer, residing in Edgeley, near Stock-  
 “port, and, with horrid threats, demand-  
 “ed entrance, to search for arms. The  
 “inhabitants, under an impression of  
 “dreadful consequences resulting from a  
 “refusal, opened the door, when a num-  
 “ber of armed men rushed into the house,  
 “and after minutely searching all parts,  
 “took away with them eight swords,  
 “leaving the affrighted inmates in a state  
 “of extreme consternation. The party  
 “consisted of from eighty to one hundred,  
 “variously armed, and they paid the strict-  
 “est obedience to the commands of one  
 “who acted as the leader, and who was of  
 “a respectable appearance. We wish we  
 “could, with that degree of justice we owe  
 “to the public’s information, here close  
 “this article; but we are sorry to say, the  
 “lapse of each day discloses some new  
 “object of alarm—some new act calcu-  
 “lated to impress upon us the most alarm-  
 “ing sensations and apprehensions for the  
 “general peace and safety of the country.  
 “It has been told us, that assemblies  
 “nightly take place in secluded places, to  
 “the number of some hundreds, that the  
 “oath continues to be administered, and  
 “that the names of those who are parties  
 “to the abominable and seditious compact,  
 “are called over at the several places of  
 “rendezvous with all the regularity and  
 “appearance of system and discipline.”

The acts here spoken of, if really com-  
 mitted, are such as call for the exertion of  
 the lawful authorities to put a stop to them.  
 They are *unlawful*, and that is enough;  
 but, then, have we not *laws*? Have we  
 not Justices and other magistrates; have  
 we not Constables and other peace officers;  
 have we not Sheriffs, who have power to  
 call out *all the people* in their several coun-  
 ties to their assistance?—To lament the  
 existence of such disturbances is unavoid-  
 able; but, I cannot help thinking, that, if  
 I were a Lord Lieutenant, or even a Sher-  
 riff, I would render, as far as my county  
 went, an application for military force un-  
 necessary.—I cannot help observing  
 here, that a great deal of mischief has, in  
 all probability, been done by those who  
 have the impudence to assume to them-  
 selves exclusively the appellation of “*loyal*  
 “men.” These men, who, for the most  
 part, live, in one way or another, upon the  
 taxes, have, in the indulgence of their  
 senseless rage against the Emperor Napo-  
 leon, been, in fact, openly inculcating the  
*right*, and even the *duty*, of a people to  
*rise in arms against their government.* I

have in my eye two remarkable instances of  
 this: one in the *COURIER*, who applauded  
 the conduct (or reported conduct) of the  
 people in Holland in flying to arms, and  
 even in pulling the Dutch Judges from the  
 Bench and dragging them along the streets.  
 The other instance was in the *TIMES* news-  
 paper, which said, not long ago, that it  
*hoped to have to record accounts of insur-*  
*rections in France.* I, as the public will  
 do me the justice to remember, remon-  
 strated with these good hirelings at the  
 time. I told that there was danger in the  
 promulgating of sentiments of this sort;  
 because, though they themselves were,  
 doubtless, able to discriminate between an  
 insurrection in England and an insurrec-  
 tion in France, some of their readers might  
 not. I, therefore, advised them to *let*  
*France alone in this respect*, stating my  
 opinion, that they would have to repent  
 having meddled with her.—As to the  
*remedy* for the disturbances, the way to  
 ascertain that, is, first to ascertain the  
*cause*; but, of that I must speak in my re-  
 marks upon the article of the *COURIER* of  
 the 29th instant, which, as I above observ-  
 ed, was published for the purpose of *feel-*  
*ing the public pulse*, and which, before I  
 proceed to my remarks, I shall, agreeably  
 to my usual practice, insert. I shall insert  
 the whole of it, because it will hereafter  
 be to be referred to. We are now, I am  
 convinced, at the *dawn* of a set of memo-  
 rable measures and events. It is, there-  
 fore, of great consequence to note down,  
 and to fix clearly in our minds, all the pre-  
 liminary steps. History often becomes  
 wholly useless for want of a knowledge of  
 the little springs which first set the ma-  
 chine in motion.—With this preface I  
 hope the reader will enter upon the article,  
 which is not long, with a disposition to at-  
 tend to its contents.—“The Message of  
 “the Prince Regent to both Houses on Sa-  
 “turday related to the violent proceedings  
 “which have taken place in several coun-  
 “ties of England. Copies of the information  
 “which has been received by Government,  
 “relative to them will be laid before  
 “Parliament to-day. The intention of  
 “Government is to move an address this  
 “afternoon to the Regent, thanking him  
 “for his communication, and to refer the  
 “information to a Secret Committee of In-  
 “quiry. Of course we do not presume to  
 “state what their report will be; but it is  
 “rumoured that a suspension of the *Habeas*  
 “*Corpus Act* will be proposed. We have,  
 “from the country papers received this



" morning, extracted accounts of the situ-  
 " ation of several districts, where, we re-  
 " gret to state, the practice of stealing  
 " arms, administering treasonable oaths,  
 " and assembling in large numbers night-  
 " ly, is carried on with increasing violence.  
 " *More vigorous measures have therefore*  
 " *become necessary.* That the Govern-  
 " ment have hitherto endeavoured to put  
 " down these outrages without demanding  
 " more extensive powers; that they hoped  
 " the laws as they stood would be suffi-  
 " cient; that they trusted the trials and  
 " punishment of some *prominent offenders*  
 " would operate as a salutary example and  
 " warning, is now adduced against them  
 " as a crime; and falsely imputing these  
 " outrages to the *Orders in Council*, the  
 " Opposition ask whether 'it is not alarm-  
 " ing that measures of such extent should  
 " be brought into discussion at this season  
 " of the year;' when it is added, 'almost  
 " all the independent Representatives of  
 " the people are on their return to the  
 " country?' What! are measures neces-  
 " sary to the public peace and safety not to  
 " be discussed because independent Repre-  
 " sentatives do not choose to attend their  
 " duty in Parliament? If they prefer their  
 " own business or pleasure to the public  
 " business, are Ministers to blame? *The*  
 " *evil which it is wished to remedy has*  
 " *grown to an alarming height only within*  
 " *a short time*, how then was it possible to  
 " bring it into discussion earlier? And  
 " with respect to the *Orders in Council*, is  
 " there *the least shadow of proof that the*  
 " *outrages were occasioned by them?*—  
 " Nay, is there not abundant evidence to  
 " shew that they had nothing to do with  
 " them? Did the *Orders in Council* pro-  
 " duce the destruction of the stocking frames  
 " in Nottinghamshire? Did they lead to  
 " the burning of the mills in Yorkshire?  
 " Did they cause the horrible assassinations  
 " in Lancashire? Have they produced the  
 " Luddite Associations and the oaths of  
 " treason which have been the consequence  
 " of them? Are arms seized and large  
 " numbers of persons drilled and disci-  
 " plined nightly because of the *Orders in*  
 " *Council*? It is absurd, if not worse, to  
 " *endeavour so to mislead the public mind.*  
 " But the *Orders in Council have been re-*  
 " *pealed!* It is known in every part of  
 " the disturbed counties that they have been  
 " repealed, and yet these outrages, so far  
 " from having abated in violence, are on  
 " the increase. TREASON is the object  
 " of these associations, and their weapons

" have hitherto been burnings and assassi-  
 " nation. Are these crimes to be palli-  
 " ated or excused, and are we to charac-  
 " terize the perpetrators of them merely as  
 " poor deluded mistaken men? They are  
 " *neither deluded nor mistaken; their ha-*  
 " *tred is against the whole form of our*  
 " *Government, and their object is to destroy*  
 " *it.* The SUSPENSION OF THE HA-  
 " BEAS CORPUS, and the PROCLA-  
 " MATION OF MARTIAL LAW may  
 " be and are measures to be deplored, but  
 " the question is, whether a *lesser evil*  
 " shall be incurred to avoid a *greater*;  
 " whether *disaffection* shall be put down  
 " and punished, or suffered to *pursue its*  
 " *march with impunity.*" —The object  
 of this article clearly is to prepare a justi-  
 fication of a *suspension* of the *Habeas Cor-*  
*pus*, or PERSONAL LIBERTY ACT,  
 and also of the subjecting of the people of  
 England to MARTIAL LAW.—Reader,  
 English reader! Reader, of whatever coun-  
 try you may be, do think a little of the  
 nature of the measures here unequivocally  
 pointed out for adoption. As to  
 the first, it would expose us, it would  
 expose any of us, it would expose every  
 man in England, TO BE PUT IN PRI-  
 SON, IN TO ANY PRISON, AND KEPT  
 THERE, DURING THE PLEASURE  
 OF THE MINISTRY, WITHOUT ANY  
 SPECIFIC CHARGE AGAINST US,  
 AND WITHOUT EVER BEING  
 BROUGHT TO TRIAL. This would be  
 the effect of the suspension of the Habeas  
 Corpus Act, which, by all our great law-  
 yers, is described as the safeguard of our  
 liberties and our lives.—The other mea-  
 sure, the proclaiming of martial law, would  
 SUBJECT US ALL TO BE TRIED BY  
 COURTS-MARTIAL, AND TO BE IM-  
 PRISONED, FLOGGED, HANGED,  
 OR SHOT, AS SUCH COURTS-MAR-  
 TIAL MIGHT ADJUDGE.—I do not  
 say, mind, that Lord Castlereagh has these  
 measures in his budget for us. No, no; I  
 do not say that; but, it is very clear, that  
 the vile Editor of the COURIER news-paper  
 is prepared to justify the proposing and the  
 adopting of these measures, which he calls  
 "a lesser evil" than that of suffering  
 "disaffection to go unpunished;" and  
 this he says, too, while he is calling upon  
 us to fight for our liberties. —However,  
 having seen his measures, let us now see  
 what are the grounds upon which he would  
 justify them. He says, that "treason is  
 "the object of the rioters; that they are nei-  
 "ther deluded nor mistaken; but that their



"*hatred is against the whole form of our government, and that their object is to destroy it.*"—This must be news indeed to the Emperor of France, who will, doubtless, be anxious to hear to how many counties of England this hatred extends itself. He will, I dare say, be amused with the reflection that a twenty years' war to keep down republicans and levellers has brought us to this; and, really, we cannot be much offended even if he should laugh at us, when he recollects that our news-papers have been expressing so anxious a desire to have to record the events of disturbances and insurrections in France.—But, where is the *proof* of the truth of this assertion of the *Courier*? Upon the strength of what evidence is it, that he sends forth these tidings so pleasing to the Emperor of France and to all the enemies of England? Where are his *proofs* of that treason and of that hatred of the whole form of the government, of which he talks? If he has the proofs, why does he not give them? And, if he has them not, how dares he make such an assertion? How dares he thus blacken the character of the people of the most populous and most valuable part of the kingdom?—He denies, that the Orders in Council have had any thing to do in the producing of the disturbances, though the evidence of a crowd of most respectable witnesses, given before both Houses of Parliament, *prove* that the Orders in Council have been *one cause*, at least, of the distresses which exist in the troubled counties; and also prove, that the *distresses have been, or, at least, originally were, the cause of the disturbances.* Yet does this unfeeling man endeavour to make the world believe, that distress has had nothing at all to do with the matter.—It has been proved, in the clearest possible manner, that, in the troubled counties, the people have suffered and are suffering, in a most cruel manner; that the food of many of them is of the worst sort and not half sufficient in quantity; that hundreds and thousands of poor mothers and their children are wholly destitute of *bread*, and that even *potatoes are too dear for them to get at*; that the food of these unfortunate creatures is *oatmeal and water*, and that they have not a sufficiency of that. It has been proved, that many have *died*, actually expired for want of food. And, it has been proved, that this want has, in part, at least, arisen from the existence of the Orders in Council.—Yet, with this proof all before him, does this unfeeling writer, this inexorable man, deny that any part of the disturbances has arisen from

distress, and that a *treasonable* intention, "a hatred to the whole form of the government and a desire to destroy it," are the sole causes.—This pampered hireling does not know what *hunger* is. It is charity to suppose that he is incapable of forming an idea of the sufferings of a human being under the craving of an appetite which there are not the means to satisfy. Let him read a passage in the history of Trenck, who, having travelled for two or three days without eating, and being in a house where he saw some victuals without having money to purchase any, says, *he rushed out of the door lest he should commit murder in order to obtain the food, which he felt himself violently tempted to do.* Let the hard-hearted hireling read this passage; let him put himself, for a moment, in the place of a father who sees a starving family around him; and, then, I should hope, that he, even *he*, will feel and express some compassion for the suffering manufacturers.—Far be it from me to attempt to justify people in the commission of unlawful acts. I do not wish to justify the woman who, according to the newspapers, committed *highway robbery* in taking *some potatoes out of a cart at Manchester*, and who, according to the news-papers, was **HANGED FOR IT.** I do not pretend to justify her conduct. But, there is, I hope, no harm in my expressing my *compassion* for her; and, I further hope, that my readers would think me a most inhuman brute, if I were to endeavour to deprive her and her unhappy fellow-sufferers of the compassion of the public; by asserting that she was actuated by a *treasonable* motive, and that she hated the whole form of our government and wished to destroy it. No, reader, I will not lend my aid to this. I allow her to have been guilty of *highway robbery* in forcibly taking *some potatoes out of a cart at Manchester*; I allow this; and I allow that the law has made *highway robbery* a crime punishable with *death*, if the judges think proper; but, I cannot and I will not allow, that her forcibly taking of some potatoes out of a cart at Manchester, was any proof of a *treasonable* design and of hatred against the whole form of our government.—Upon some future occasion I will give a picture of the mode of living of a poor man and his family in England, and will shew how far his wages will go with the quartern loaf at 20 pence. At present I shall add only one remark to what has been said above, and that is, that though this hired writer could see nothing but *treason* to arm the government against,



LORD SIDMOUTH could. He could see, not only an insurrection of the head to provide against, but also an insurrection of the *belly*; for, in the speech by which he introduced his motion for thanks to the Regent for his Message, he is reported to have said;—"They (the government) ought to be prepared for the worst. If their hopes should prove to be unfounded; if it should please Providence to afflict the country with another BAD HARVEST; how heavy would be the responsibility of the Government; how heavy that of their Lordships, if they neglected to take such precautionary measures as the occasion required?"—Very true, my lord! Really, very true! And, doubtless, as you are so sensible of the heavy responsibility that will fall upon you both as a minister and a lord, if precautionary measures are not taken to meet the affliction of another *bad harvest*; this being the case you, doubtless, have in view some means either of *augmenting the wages or income of the poor*, or, of *lowering the price of their food*. There appear to me to be only these two sets of means; and, as your lordship seems to be so fully sensible of the responsibility, there can be no doubt that one or the other will be employed. The former object might be accomplished, to a great extent, at least, by certain *savings* which I will hereafter take the liberty to point out to your lordship; and the latter, by adding to the quantity of corn by importation. But, I have not now room to do any thing more than merely open this most interesting of all subjects.—We must now, before we take our leave of this subject for the present, return to the House of Commons, where, on Tuesday, the 30th of June, we find the ballot producing the following members for the Secret Committee:

G. Canning	Lord G. L. Gower
W. Wilberforce	Lord Milton
Lord Castlereagh	C. Long
H. Lascelles	H. Goulbourn
W. Lambe	J. S. Wortley
Samuel Whitbread	Lord Newark
The M. of the Rolls	— Paget
D. Davenport	G. Tierney
J. Blackburne	H. Leicester
W. W. Bootle	T. Babbington.
C. Yorke	

Upon the names being read over Mr. Whitbread said "this List contained the identical names that he had seen handed about this morning. The present was therefore neither more nor less than the Treasury List, as all Committees bal-

loted for in this manner were uniformly found to be."—The reader will ask, perhaps, how it comes, then, that Mr. Whitbread's own name was put on it: but, reader, of what use is his name, if there be a majority on the side of the minister?—Such, then, is this SECRET Committee. And, what is this Committee to do? Why, it is to examine the SEaled UP papers; and, then it is to make a report to the House of the result of its inquiries, and of the measures which it thinks proper to recommend in consequence. And then the House is to decide without seeing the papers! Or, I suppose, at least, that this is the course, it having been so in other cases of Secret Committees.—Having now given this subject an opening, and having brought the history of the Luddite measures down to the appointment of the Committee of Secrecy; I shall, for the present, take my leave of it, with once more requesting my readers to WATCH THE WHIGS, and mark what their conduct will be through the whole of this transaction.—In neither House have they yet opened their lips upon the subject.

#### SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

**LIBEL CASE.**—*Messrs. Hunt.*—These Gentlemen, proprietors of the *EXAMINER*, were, in the term before the last, prosecuted by Ex-Officio Information by the then Attorney General (*Gibbs*), who is now become a *Puisne Judge*, for the publishing of a passage, in which the writer gives his opinion of the qualities and character of the Prince Regent.—The trial, by SPECIAL Jury, as usual, was to come before the court of King's Bench, at Westminster Hall, on Friday, the 26th of June. But, the Special Gentlemen being called over, and only six answering to their names, the trial was put off, and, of course, it cannot come on till after the next term.—It is curious enough, that the last time that these gentlemen were before the same court, only six of the Special Gentlemen appeared, and, of course, six others were called up promiscuously out of the *common pannel*. Messrs. Hunt were acquitted upon that occasion.—Various conjectures have been hazarded as to the cause of this putting off; but, while I pretend to know nothing of that cause, I do know this, that the parties prosecuted have been put to a certain expense, and that not a light one; that



they are now to remain, *marked out as criminals*, for another four or five months; and that, if acquitted or unprosecuted at last, there is no means of their obtaining compensation for their anxiety and loss.

—They have behaved, however, most manfully upon the occasion; they will receive for that conduct, as they merit, the thanks of all the real friends of public liberty; and they will, I trust, live to see the day, when they will receive a more solid reward in beholding the triumph of that cause in which they are labouring with so much diligence, spirit, talent, and effect.

**BRISTOL ELECTION.**—From the Letter, at the head of this sheet, the reader will find a pretty good preface to the history of this *Election*, which is quite another sort of thing than what the friends of Sir Samuel Romilly appear to have taken an election at Bristol to be.—The intelligence which I have from that City comes down to Wednesday last, the 1st instant. I may, and, I dare say, I shall, have it to a later date before this Number goes to the Press; but, I shall now give the history down to that day.—Sir Samuel Romilly's friends, at their meeting at the Crown and Anchor, talked of Mr. *Prothero* as an opponent; but, not a word did they say of Mr. HUNT. A farmer was, I suppose, thought beneath their notice. We shall, however, see that farmer doing more at Bristol, I imagine, than they and their subscription will ever be able to do.—In the Letter, before inserted, I have shown how Mr. Hunt, whose residence is in Sussex, was taken by surprise. He was wholly ignorant of the vacancy, 'till *Thursday evening*, the 25th of June, when his news-paper of Wednesday informed him that the writ, in the room of Mr. Bragge, had been moved for on Tuesday.—He came to London on Friday, set off that night for Bath, and got into Bristol on *Saturday evening*, where he was received by the people with a pleasure proportioned to their surprise at seeing him come.—Hart Davis had made his entry in an earlier part of the day, preceded by the carriages of bankers, excise and custom-house people, and, in short, all that description of persons who are every where found in opposition to the liberties of Englishmen.—As it was settled amongst the parties, that Davis was to meet with no opposition from either MR. PROTHERO or SIR SAMUEL ROMILLY, he expected a *chairing* on the Monday, amidst the shouts of some score

or two of hired voices. How great was his surprise, then, and how great the consternation of his party, when they saw it announced that Mr. Hunt was about to make his appearance!—*Sunday* (the 28th of June) passed, of course, without any *business* being done, but not without “*dreadful note of preparation.*”—On Monday morning, the day appointed by the Sheriffs for holding the election, the Guildhall, the place for holding the election, became a scene of great interest: an injured and insulted people resolved to assert their rights against the intrigues and the violences of a set of men who were attempting to rob them of those rights.—After the *nominations* had taken place, the sheriffs adjourned their court till the next day.—In the evening great strife and fighting and violences took place; the *White Lion Inn*, whence the *Club* who put in Mr. Bragge, and who are now at work for Davis, takes its name; this Inn was assailed by the *people's party*, and, it is said, pretty nearly demolished. Mr. Davis's house at Clifton is said to have shared the same fate; and, this and similar work, with terrible battles in the streets having continued till Tuesday night (the 30th of June), the SOLDIERS WERE CALLED IN, AND, IT IS SAID, ACTUALLY MARCHED, INTO THE GUILD-HALL!—Pause, here, reader. Look at this spectacle.—But, how came this to be *necessary*? It is said, that it was *necessary*, in order to *preserve property*. But, *how came it to be so*? Who began the violences? That is the question.—And I have no hesitation in stating my firm belief, that they were begun, not by the PEOPLE, but by their enemies.—I state, upon the authority of Mr. JOHN ALLEN of Bath, whom I know to be a man of honour, of strict veracity, and (if that be any additional praise) of great property: upon the authority of this gentleman, who requests me to use his name, and who was an eye-witness of what he relates, I state, that, there were about 400 men, who had been *made special constables for the purpose*, who were planted near the place of election; that these men, who ought to have been for one side as much as for the other, were armed with *staves* or *clubs*, painted BLUE, which, the reader will observe, is the colour of the White Lion, or Bragge and Davis, party, and, of course, the PEOPLE, who were for Mr. Hunt, looked upon these 400 men as brought for the purpose of overawing



them and preventing them by force from exercising their rights. These men committed, during the 29th, many acts of violence against the people. But, at last, the people, *after great numbers of them had been wounded*, armed themselves with *Clubs too*; attacked the Blues, and drove them into the White Lion.—Here the mischief would have ended; but the Blues, ascending to the *upper rooms and the roof*, had the baseness to throw down *stones, brick-bats, tiles, glass bottles*, and other things, upon the heads of the people. This produced an attack upon the house, which was soon broken in, and, I believe, gutted.—These facts I state upon the authority of Mr. Allen; and I state them with a perfect conviction of their truth.—

The reader will observe, that the great point, is, WHO BEGAN THE FIGHT? We have heard Mr. Allen; now let us hear what the other parties say. In the *TIMES* news-paper of the 2d July, it is said by a writer of a letter from Bristol, who abuses Mr. Hunt, that when the nomination was about to take place, “Mr. Davis and his party made their appearance. The friends of Mr. Davis wore *blue cockades*, and they were accompanied by *some hundreds of persons bearing short BLUE STAVES*, who had been sworn in as *special constables*.”—This is enough. Here is a full acknowledgment of the main circumstance stated by Mr. Allen: namely, that hundreds of men, sworn in as Constables, were armed with *staves* of the colour of one of the candidates, and that they *accompanied that candidate* to the Hustings.—In the *COURIER* of the 1st July, the same fact, in other words comes out. The writer (of another letter from Bristol), in speaking of the precautions intended to be taken, says: “Our Chief Magistrate has summoned his brother officers together, and as the constables assembled by Mr. Davis’s friends are to be all dismissed at the close of the poll, and *their colours taken out of their hats*, there will be no provocation on his part to Mr. HUNT’s party.”—This, coming from the enemy, clearly shews on which side the aggression had commenced.—Therefore, for all that followed, the party of Davis are responsible.—We shall know, by-and-by, perhaps, who it was that *permitted* these hundreds of Constables to hoist the colours of one of the candidates, which was, in fact, “a declaration of war against the people,” and as such the Letter in the *TIMES* says it was

regarded.—Well, but the SOLDIERS ARE CALLED IN; and, as I am informed, the Soldiers were, on Wednesday morning between *five and six o’clock*, addressed by Mr. Hunt in nearly the following words: “Gentlemen; Soldiers; fellow citizens and countrymen, I have to ask a favour of you, and that is, that you will discover *no hostility to each other* on account of your being dressed in different coloured coats. You are all equally interested in this election. You are all Englishmen; you must all love freedom; and, therefore, act towards each other as brother towards brother.” It is added by my informant, that Mr. Hunt was greatly applauded by the *whole* of his audience.—He expressed his conviction, that the soldiers would not voluntarily shoot at their countrymen; “but,” added he, “if military force is to carry the election, the sooner the shooting begins the better; and here am I,” said he, laying bare his breast, “ready to receive the first ball.”—Let us now see how the *faction* view this matter.—The *COURIER* abuses Mr. Hunt in the style to be expected. The *Times* speaks of him in this way: “The poll commenced at ten o’clock. In this *farce* Mr. Hunt plays many parts: he unites in himself the various characters of *Candidate, Counsel, and Committee*, as he has *not one human being to assist him* in either of those capacities.”—Well, and what then? What does he want more than a good cause and the support of the people? These are all that ought to be necessary to any candidate. What business have lawyers with elections? And, ought the people to want any committee to tell them their duty? The *Morning Chronicle* takes a more sanctimonious tone. It says on the 2d of July, (in the form of a letter from Bristol: “It is much to be regretted, that the *regularity and peaceable demeanour* with which our Elections were formerly conducted, are now totally disregarded. Notwithstanding the exertions of Mr. Davis’s, Mr. Protheroe’s, and Sir S. Romilly’s friends, to prevent a recurrence of the outrages which endangered Mr. Bathurst’s life at a late Election, the procession on Saturday was assailed by *vollies of mud, stones, dead cats, &c.* Mr. Davis fortunately escaped unhurt, except from one stone which struck his arm.” Here are two things to be observed: first, that Davis, Prothero, and Sir Samuel Romilly’s friends, the friends of all of them are here spoken of as *co-ope-*



rating. Aye, to be sure! League with the devil against the rights of the people! This is a true *Whig trail*. But, the *mud, stones, and dead cats!* Who in all the world could have thrown them at "the amiable Mr. Davis?" It must have been some *Bristol people* certainly; and that of their own accord too, for *Mr. Hunt was not there at the time*.—Mark how these prints discover each other's falsehoods. The *Courier* of the 1st July gave us an account of Mr. Davis's gracious reception. It told us, that "RICHARD HART DAVIS, Esq. the late Member for Colchester, and the professed candidate of the *White Lion party* in this city, was met at Clifton on Saturday by an immense body of freeholders and freemen, consisting of the most respectable and opulent inhabitants of the city, and was preceded to the Exchange by a cavalcade of upwards of one hundred carriages, and a numerous body of his friends on horseback and on foot."—But, not a word about the *mud, stones, and dead cats*, with which he was saluted. Yet these were flung at him; and flung at him, too, by the people of Bristol; by hands unbought; for Mr. Hunt spends not a farthing. They were a *voluntary offering* on the part of those men of Bristol who were not to be corrupted.—The *Courier* of Thursday 2d July, states, that both *horse and foot soldiers* had been marched into Bristol.—SIR FRANCIS BURDETT mentioned this circumstance in the House of Commons on Thursday evening. The Secretary at War said he did not know of the troops being brought into the city. But this will be found to have been the case.

WM. COBBETT.

*State Prison, Newgate,  
Friday, 3rd July, 1812.*

### MINISTERIAL NEGOCIATIONS.

DOCUMENTS PUBLISHED, RELATING TO THE LATE NEGOCIATIONS FOR MAKING A NEW MINISTRY.

(Continued from page 832.)

May, 1812, were intended by His Royal Highness to constitute the foundation of his Administration.—That His Royal High-

ness had signified his pleasure, that Lord Wellesley should conduct the formation of the Administration in all its branches, and should be First Commissioner of the Treasury; and that Lord Moira, Lord Erskine, and Mr. Canning, should be Members of the Cabinet.—That it was probable, that a Cabinet, formed on an enlarged basis, must be extended to the number of twelve or thirteen Members: that the Prince Regent wished Lords Grey and Grenville, on the part of their friends, to recommend for His Royal Highness's approbation the names of four persons, (if the Cabinet should consist of twelve) and of five Persons, (if the Cabinet should consist of thirteen) to be appointed by His Royal Highness to fill such stations in His Councils as might hereafter be arranged.—That His Royal Highness left the selection of the names to Lords Grey and Grenville, without any exception or personal exclusion.—That in completing the new arrangement, the Prince Regent has granted to Lord Wellesley, entire liberty to propose for His Royal Highness's approbation, the names of any persons now occupying stations in His Royal Highness's Councils, or of any other persons.—That if the proposition made to Lords Grey and Grenville, should be accepted as the outline of an arrangement, all other matters would be discussed with the most anxious solicitude to promote harmony and general accommodation.

WELLESLEY.

No. 18.—*Lord Grey to Lord Wellesley, dated 2d June, on the Subject of No. 17.*

My Lord,—I lost no time in sending for Lord Grenville, and have communicated to him, since his arrival, the proposal made to me yesterday by your Lordship.—We have felt the necessity of a further communication with our friends, and this, I fear, will make it impossible for us to send our final answer to the minute which I had the honour of receiving from your Lordship yesterday evening, till a late hour to-night, or early to-morrow morning.—To obviate, however, as far as I can, any inconvenience which might arise from this delay, I think it right to state to your Lordship, that the feeling which I yester-

(To be continued.)